1 2 3 4	RICHARD HONG (Trial Counsel) (Admitted in New York) Attorneys for Plaintiff SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION 100 F Street, N.E. Wsahington, DC 20549-4010-A Telephone: (202) 551-4431 Facsimile: (202) 772-9246		
5	Email: hongr@sec.gov		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
9			
10	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE	Case No. C 07-3444 JF	
11	COMMISSION,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT ORDER	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	vs.	Hon. Jeremy Fogel	
14	MARK LESLIE, et al.,		
15	Defendants.		
Steven E. Rindner, a defendant in the case captioned Securities and Exchange  Commission v. Kelly et al., Civ. No. 08 cv 4612 (S.D.N.Y.) (hereinafter "Related Case")  currently pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New Your requested the discovery of documents and transcripts from Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"), the plaintiff in that case and the instant case. Some of the materials requested Rindner fall under the confidentiality provision of the Joint Case Management Statement September 28, 2007. After discussions among counsel for Mr. Rindner and the parties in above-captioned litigation, it is agreed as follows:  (1) Pursuant to Mr. Rindner's Third Request for the Production of Document Rule 45 Subpoena dated May 26, 2009, as set forth in Exhibit A (attached hereto), the Statement agreed to produce responsive discovery requests/responses and deposition testimony transports.		(S.D.N.Y.) (hereinafter "Related Case"), ourt for the Southern District of New York, has ripts from Securities and Exchange Commission case. Some of the materials requested by Mr. of the Joint Case Management Statement of ounsel for Mr. Rindner and the parties in the s: Request for the Production of Documents and rth in Exhibit A (attached hereto), the SEC has	
	CONSENT ORDER SEC v. MARK LESLIE, et al., Civil Action No. C 07-344-JF		

in the SEC v. Leslie case (hereinafter, "Protected Documents"). However, the SEC will not produce any responsive discovery requests/responses or portions of deposition testimony transcripts which relate to confidential financial information of the defendants in the SEC v. Leslie case; the defendants in SEC v. Leslie will identify such confidential documents for the SEC, and provide to the SEC appropriately redacted deposition transcripts for production, within 14 (fourteen) days of the entry of this order.

- (2) Access to Protected Documents shall be restricted to persons authorized by this Order, namely Mr. Rindner, Joseph E. Ripp, John Michael Kelly and Mark Wovsaniker (the defendants in the Related Case, collectively, the "Related Case Defendants"), and the SEC in the Related Case; their attorneys of record; and attorneys, paralegals, investigators, experts, and secretaries or other individuals employed by, or performing work on behalf of, the attorneys of record for the Related Case Defendants and the SEC in the Related Case.
- (3) The following restrictions are placed on the Related Case Defendants and the other above-designated individuals, unless and until further ordered by the Court. The Related Case Defendants and the other individuals designated above shall not:
  - make copies for, or allow copies of any kind to be made by, any other person of Protected Documents;
  - b. allow any other person to read Protected Documents;
  - c. communicate the substance of the information in Protected Documents to anyone else, other than to non-party witnesses (or their attorneys) whom the parties are preparing for deposition or trial testimony in the Related Case;
  - use, directly or indirectly, Protected Documents, or any of the information contained in Protected Document, for any purpose other than preparing for the trial in the litigation of the Related Case;
  - e. use any deposition or trial testimony generated in the Related Case that discloses, refers to, or was generated by information contained in

Protected Documents for any purpose other than preparing for the trial in the Related Case.

- (4) The scope of this Order is intended to confine the use of Protected Documents and the information contained in Protected Documents and the information contained in Protected Documents to the litigation in the Related Case. Any other use of Protected Documents and the information contained in Protected Documents would violate this Order.
- (5) The Related Case Defendants' attorneys shall inform any person to whom disclosure shall be made pursuant to this Order of the existence and terms of this Order. All individuals receiving any Protected Documents shall agree with the terms of this Order and shall not otherwise disclose Protected Documents to the public or any other person or entity other than pursuant to the terms of this Order, and shall acknowledge their agreement to comply with the provisions of this Order by signing a copy of the attached acknowledgement form. The disclosing party will retain copies of signed acknowledgment forms until such time as the Related Case, including all appeals, is concluded.
- (6) Nothing in this Order shall restrict the use or introduction of Protected

  Documents as evidence or exhibits by the Related Case Defendants' attorneys or the SEC's attorneys during any deposition or trial in the Related Case.
- (7) Upon conclusion of the Related Case, the Related Case Defendants' attorneys shall return to counsel for the SEC, or destroy and certify to counsel for the SEC the destruction of, all Protected Documents within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed 30 days after the last appeal in the Related Case is final.
- (8) This Order does not constitute any ruling on the question of whether any particular document or category of information is properly discoverable and does not

constitute any ruling on any potential objection to the discoverability, relevance, or admissibility of any Protected Documents. Any and all disputes related to this Consent Order shall be resolved in the (9) United States District Court for the Northern District of California. CONSENT ORDER SEC v. MARK LESLIE, et al.,

Civil Action No. C 07-344-JF

1	AGREED AND CONSENTED TO:	
2	Dated:	
3	Dated.	Richard Hong
4		Counsel for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Compaission
5		
6	Dated: Angust 18, 2009	
7		Johathan/Drimmer Counsel for Related Case Defendant Steven E. Rindner
8	[	
9	Dated:	
10		Counsel for Related Case Defendant Joseph E.
12		Ripp
13	Datad Array 24 19 2009	All San I
14	Dated: August 19,2009	ju juc y
15		Counsel for Related Case Defendant John Michael Kelly
16		
17	Dated:	
18	·	Counsel for Related Case Defendant Mark
19		Wovsaniker
20	Durd	
21	Dated:	
22		Counsel for Defendant Mark Leslie
23		
24	Dated:	
25		Counsel for Defendant Kenneth E. Lonchar
26		and the second s
27	Dated:	
28		Counsel for Defendant Paul A. Sallaberry
	CONSENT ORDER SEC v. MARK LESLIE, et al., Civil Action No. C 07-344-JF	3

1	AGREED AND CONSENTED TO:	
2	Dated: Argust 21, 2009	MM
3	Ballon Mysus) =1, =0	Richard Hong
4	<b>,</b>	Counsel for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Compaission
5	5	Compassion
6	Dated: Agrir 18, 2009	
7	13 U 7	Jonathan Drimmer
8	.	Gounsel for Related Case Defendant Steven E. Rindner
9	.	10
10	Dated: Agust 14, 2009	meg itte
11	11703 11,000 /	Counsel for Related Case Defendant Joseph E.
12		Ripp
13	Dated:	-
14	11	
15		Counsel for Related Case Defendant John Michael Kelly
16		
17	Dated: August 20, 2009	Leichardt
18.	•	GLENN R. REICHARD T Counsel for Related Case Defendant Mark
19	·	Wovsaniker Case Describant Mark
.20		
21	Dated:	
22		Counsel for Defendant Mark Leslie
23		
24	Dated:	
25		
26		Counsel for Defendant Kenneth E. Lonchar
27	Dated:	
28	-	
		Counsel for Defendant Paul A. Sallaberry
	CONSENT ORDER SEC v. MARK LESLIE, et al.,	
	Civil Action No. C 07-344-JF	
	· ·	

	The state of the s	
1	AGREED AND CONSENTED TO:	
2	2 Dated:	
3		
4	Comprission	curities and Exchange
5		
6	Ionathan Drimmer	
7 8	/ Gounsel for Related Ca	se Defendant Steven E.
9		
10	Dated:	
11	Counsel for Related Cas	se Defendant Joseph E.
12	Ripp	•
13	Dated:	
14		D 0 1 21
15	Counsel for Related Cas Michael Kelly	e Defendant John
16	· -	
17	7 Dated:	
18	Counsel for Related Casi	e Defendant Mark
19		Λ
20	Dated: 8/14/01	7
21	Anthony P.	Schoenlarg lark Leslie
23		
24		n
25	S/26/01 ROBINI INSERIA	
26	Counsel for Defendant K	enneth E. Lonchar
27	Dated: 8/26/09	en-
28	BII GREGG S. FARA	No
	Counsel for Defendant Pa	IUI A. Saliaberry
- 11	CONSENT ORDER SEC v MARK LESLIE, et al., Civil Action No. C 07-344-JF	

## 

1			
$\ $	IT IS SO ODDEDED		
	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
	Dated:		Magistrate Judge Patricia V. Turnbull
7			
3			
		•	
)			
2			
;     -			
5			
,			
)			
:			
.			
S	CONSENT ORDER SEC v. MARK LESLIE, et al., Civil Action No. C 07-344-JF		

	11	
1	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTR	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN JOS	E DIVISION
4		
5	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE	
6	COMMISSION,	Case No. C 07-3444 JF
7	Plaintiff,	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONSENT ORDER
8	vs.	UKDEK
9	MARK LESLIE, et al.,	
10	Defendants.	
11		
12	I,, hereby a	cknowledge, under penalty of perjury, that I have
13	read the Consent Order entered by the Court or	1, 2009. I am familiar with the
14		
15	specific terms of the Consent Order and agree to by bound by its terms. I further understand that	
16	I am subject to the contempt powers of this Court for violation of this Consent Order.	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	Date:	<del>_</del>
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		7
	CONSENT ORDER SEC v. MARK LESLIE, et al., Civil Action No. C 07-344-JF	